

A CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

NOV 13 2007

ATTEST
FOR THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

OCT 25 2007

FILED
CLERK'S OFFICE

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

MDL No. 1871

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO-1)

On October 16, 2007, the Panel transferred two civil actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. See ____ F.Supp.2d ____ (J.P.M.L. 2007). With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M. Rufe.

It appears that the actions on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and assigned to Judge Rufe.

Pursuant to Rule 7.4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001), these actions are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the reasons stated in the order of October 16, 2007, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M. Rufe.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 15 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 15-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

FOR THE PANEL:


Jeffrey M. Lüthi
Clerk of the Panel

Inasmuch as no objection is
pending at this time, the
stay is lifted.

NOV 13 2007

CLERK'S OFFICE
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

**IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

MDL No. 1871

SCHEDULE CTO-1 - TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

DIST. DIV. C.A.#

CASE CAPTION

ARKANSAS WESTERN
ARW 1 07-1088

Jimmy Mason v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.

CALIFORNIA CENTRAL
CAC 2 07-6149
CAC 5 07-1109

Alicia H. Rodriguez, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.
James Roland v. GlaxoSmithKline

FLORIDA SOUTHERN
FLS 1 07-22434
FLS 9 07-80816

Jose Izquierdo v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.
Clifford Cartwright, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline

ILLINOIS SOUTHERN
ILS 3 07-506

Donald R. Knight v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.

INDIANA SOUTHERN
INS 1 07-1202

William Bass v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.

LOUISIANA EASTERN
LAE 2 07-4013

Junita Cuccia v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.

NEW JERSEY
NJ 2 07-3291

Richard V. D'Apuzzo v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.

NEW YORK EASTERN
NYE 2 07-4016

Michael Miracolo v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.

NEW YORK SOUTHERN
NYS 1 07-4006
NYS 1 07-7879
NYS 1 07-7896
NYS 1 07-7898
NYS 1 07-7899
NYS 1 07-8137
NYS 1 07-8138
NYS 1 07-8141
NYS 1 07-8170
NYS 7 07-4636

Sheila E. Schrank v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.
Frank W. Curley v. SmithKline Beechman Corp., et al.
Kim Griffin v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.
Donald Spallone v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.
Linda Madison, etc. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.
Jesse Pitt v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.
Victor Estevez v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.
Aida Rojas v. SmithKline Beechman Corp., et al.
Harvey A. Silverstein, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.
Benjamin Sarconi v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.

MDL No. 1871 - Schedule CTO-1 Tag-Along Actions (Continued)

<u>DIST. DIV. C.A.#</u>	<u>CASE CAPTION</u>
OHIO NORTHERN OHN 1 07-2841	Marvin Phillips, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC
OKLAHOMA EASTERN OKE 6 07-305	Ray Donahoo, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC
PUERTO RICO PR 3 07-1854	Maria Del-Rosario-Pagan, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC, et al.
TENNESSEE EASTERN TNE 3 07-266	J. Terry Holland, et al. v. GlaxoSmithKline, PLC Opposed 11/8/07
TENNESSEE WESTERN TNW 2 07-2428	Lula Trass v. GlaxoSmithKline, Inc.
TEXAS EASTERN TXE 1 07-586 TXE 2 07-254	Barry Nicholas v. SmithKline Beecham Corp. Peggie Stanford, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.